



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

MF

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/111,803	07/08/98	FUKUCHI	H JAO-40854

OLIFF & BERRIDGE
P O BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA VA 22320

WM01/0103

EXAMINER

CHUNG, D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2672

DATE MAILED: 01/03/01

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/111,803

Applicant(s)

FUKUCHI, HIDEO

Examiner

Daniel J Chung

Art Unit

2672

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 October 2000.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-32 are presented for examination. Claims 23-32 have been added by the amendment filed on 10-18-2000. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 10-18-2000.

The objection to the title has been withdrawn because of amendment.

Priority

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in Japan on January 28, 1997. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the Priority application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 15, 17, 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawasaki et al (4,246,578) in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

Regarding claim 1, Kawasaki et al discloses that the claimed feature of an information display apparatus (See Abstract, col 1 line 4-col 2 line 26) comprising: a display unit that displays information: (See Abstract, col 1 line 4-col 2 line 26) [display control] means for controlling a display operation of said display unit: (See Abstract, col 1 line 4-col 2 line 26) and an operating unit that designates a display operation of said display unit, said display control means causing a new line of characters to be started wherever it would otherwise be required to break the work across two lines of a plurality of lines of characters of said information, and displaying the plurality of lines of characters of said information on said display unit in a font having a width that varies according to the type of character displayed, and said display control means controlling the display operation of said display unit so that a spacing between the characters is constant. (See Fig 2, col 2 line 64-col 3 line 32)

Kawasaki et al does not explicitly disclose that " display control." However, AAPA teaches that " calling receivers equipped with a message display function." (See spec p. 1 line 1-24) It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Kawasaki et al with AAPA, because they both relate to displaying the messages more effectively. Also, having display control units is necessarily required for every user controlled information display system. By using the display control units, users can advantageously change/operate the information on the display with easy manner.

Regarding claim 2, refer to the discussion for claim 1 hereinabove, AAPA discloses that display control means causing a new line of characters to be started whenever it would otherwise be required to break a word across two of said lines of characters. (See spec p.1 line 31-p.2 line 3)

Regarding claim 3, refer to the discussion for claim 1 hereinabove, AAPA discloses that the claimed feature of an information display apparatus, comprising:

A display unit that displays information

Display control means for controlling a display operation of said display unit

An operating unit that designates a display operation of said display unit, said display control means causing said display unit to form a fixed display when an amount of information to be displayed is not greater than a number of lines displayable on said display unit in one frame

Said display control means causing said display unit to form a vertical scrolling display when an amount of information to be displayed exceeds a number of lines displayable on said display unit in one frame.

Regarding claims 15, refer to the discussion for claim 1 hereinabove, AAPA discloses that a communication circuit that receives information, the information received via said communication circuit being displayed on said display unit in response to said display control means. (See spec p.1 line 1-24)

Regarding claim 17, claim 17 is equivalent to claim 3, and thus the rejection to claim 3 hereinabove is also applicable to claim 17, but applied in view of the rejection to base claim 15.

Regarding claim 19, refer to the discussion for claim 1 hereinabove, AAPA discloses that an [antenna unit] for receiving a signal via said communication circuit. (See spec p.1 line 1-24)

AAPA does not explicitly disclose that " an antenna unit." However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant' s invention, because an antenna unit is necessarily required for receiving a signal in communication system.

Regarding claim 21, refer to the discussion for claim 1 hereinabove, AAPA discloses that communication circuit receiving an individually selective calling signal or a message via said antenna unit. (See spec p.1 line 1-24)

Regarding claim 23, Kawasaki et al discloses that display control means comprising at least one of a processing unit and a storage device. (See Fig 3, Fig 11, col 1 line 39-47)

Regarding claim 24, Kawasaki et al discloses that processing unit comprising at least one of a switching monitor section and a message determining section. (See Fig 3, Fig 11)

Regarding claim 25, Kawasaki et al discloses that storage device storing a plurality of fonts. (See Fig 3, Fig 11, col 1 line 39-47)

Regarding claims 26-28, claims 26-28 are respectively equivalent to claims 23-25, and thus the rejections to claims 23-25 hereinabove are also respectively applicable to claims 26-28, but applied in view of the rejections to base claim 3.

Regarding claims 29-32, claims 29-32 are similar in scope to the claims 1 and 3, and thus the rejections to claims 1 and 3 hereinabove are also applicable to claim 29-32.

Claims 4-14, 16, 18, 20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawasaki et al in view of AAPA, and further in view of Kent (5,528,260).

Regarding claim 4, AAPA discloses that display control means causing the scrolling display to be [automatically scrolled] a plurality of times continuously by said display unit. (See spec p.2 line 4-23)

The combination of Kawasaki et al and AAPA does not explicitly disclose that "scrolling display to be automatically scrolled." However, Kent teaches that "the data is automatically scrolled." (See col 1 line 35-56, col 2 line 57-col 3 line 40, col 6 line 5-67) It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Kawasaki et al and AAPA with Kent, because they all relate to displaying information with effective manner. Also, the function of automatic scrolling will advantageously save the time and cost by eliminating the step of user's operations such as moving the mouse and pressing the button, as it will allow the user to see next unrevealed information without any delay.

Regarding claim 5, refer to the discussion for claim 4 hereinabove, Kent discloses that display control means changing a scroll speed for forming the scrolling display in accordance with an operation performed on said operating unit. (See col 3 line 25-40, col 5 line 43-col 6 line 59)

Regarding claim 6, refer to the discussion for claim 4 hereinabove, Kent discloses that display control means changing the scroll speed in accordance with an operation externally performed on said operating unit, the operation providing an

instruction to change a predetermined scroll speed determined at the start of the scrolling display. (See col 3 line 25-40, col 5 line 43-col 6 line 59)

Regarding claim 7, refer to the discussion for claim 4 hereinabove, Kent discloses that display control means presetting the scroll speed determined at the start of the scrolling display by operation of a switch button on said operating unit. (See col 3 line 16-40)

Regarding claim 8, refer to the discussion for claim 4 hereinabove, Kent discloses that display control means causing said display unit to form [a demonstration display] at a currently set scroll speed, the scroll speed being determined at the start of the scrolling display by said operating unit. (See col 3 line 16-40, col 5 line 43-col 6 line 59)

Kent does not explicitly disclose that " demonstration display at a currently set scroll speed." However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant 's invention, because using a demonstration display will advantageously allow the user to set the scrolling speed with easy manner.

Regarding claim 9, claims 9 is equivalent to claims 1, 3 and 4, and thus the rejections to claims 1, 3 and 4 hereinabove are also applicable to claim 9.

Regarding claim 10, Kawasaki et al discloses that display control means causing said display unit to display information formed of a group of characters vertically or horizontally over a plurality of lines. (See Abstract, Fig 1, Fig 2, col 2 line 64-col 3 line 32)

Regarding claims 11-14, claims 11-14 are respectively equivalent to claims 5-8, and thus the rejections to claims 5-8 hereinabove are also respectively applicable to claims 11-14, but applied in view of the rejections to base claim 9.

Regarding claim 16, claim 16 is equivalent to claim 15, and thus the rejection to claim 15 hereinabove is also applicable to claim 16, but applied in view of the rejection to base claim 9.

Regarding claim 18, claim 18 is equivalent to claim 17, and thus the rejection to claim 17 hereinabove is also applicable to claim 18, but applied in view of the rejection to base claim 16.

Regarding claim 20, claim 20 is equivalent to claim 19, and thus the rejection to claim 19 hereinabove is also applicable to claim 20, but applied in view of the rejection to base claim 16.

Regarding claim 22, claim 22 is equivalent to claim 21, and thus the rejection to claim 21 hereinabove is also applicable to claim 22, but applied in view of the rejection to base claim 20.

Response to Arguments/Amendment

Applicant's arguments and amendments received on 10-13-2000 have been carefully considered. However, they do not overcome the previous rejections, which have been maintained. Thus, the finality of this office action is deemed proper.

In Remarks, Applicant argued that the cited reference does not disclose that "a display control means that causes a new line of characters to be started wherever it would otherwise be required to break the word across two lines of a plurality of lines of characters of information, and that displays the plurality of lines of characters of the information on a display unit in a font having a width that varies according to the type of character displayed." (See Remarks p.1 line 10-15, p. 1 line 18-23, p.3 line 10-15, p.3 line 20-p.4 line 1) However, the cited reference discloses that display control means that causes a new line of characters to be started wherever it would otherwise be required to break the word across two lines of a plurality of lines of characters of information, (See p.2 line 1-2 in Background of the invention of Applicant's application (AAPA)) and that displays the plurality of lines of characters of the information on a

display unit in a font having a width that varies according to the type of character displayed (See Fig 2 Kawasaki, also See Remarks p.1 line 16-17 as admitted by Applicant)

Furthermore, Applicant argued that the cited reference does not disclose "display control means that cases a display unit to form a fixed display when an amount of information to be displayed is not greater than a number of lines displayable in one frame, and that causes the display unit to form a vertical scrolling display when an amount of information to be displayed exceeds a number of lines displayable on the display unit in one frame" (See Remarks p.2 line 5-9) and "display unit to automatically form a scrolling display." (See Remarks p.3 line 1-2, p.3 line 15-19, p.4 line 1-5) However, Kent discloses that using of auto-scrolling method when the information contained in the file is greater than what can be displayed in the window at one time. (See col 1 line 23-39) Although Kent does not explicitly teach scrolling display (e.g. scrolling bar) in window, this is well-known art in an analogous art. According to On-Line Dictionary of Computing, scroll bar is used to view an arbitrary location in the display area. Also, most of software application in modern technology (e.g. Window operation system or word processing programs) have scrolling function with scroll bar whenever graphical or text inputs exceed the window size. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to incorporate the scrolling display into the teaching of cited reference.

Regarding claims 29-32, see the argument and rejections hereinabove.

Conclusion

Applicant's response and amendment are not persuasive and the previous grounds of rejection have been maintained. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 308-6606 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2021 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel J. Chung whose telephone number is (703) 306-3419. He can normally be reached Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays from 7:30am - 5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi, can be reached on (703) 305-4713. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

djc
December 22, 2000



MATTHEW LUU
PRIMARY EXAMINER